

The Woman of Samaria.

And Lord, to us, as vile as she,
Thy gracious lips have told
That mystery of love, revealed
At Jacob's Well of old.

In spirit Lord, we've sat with Thee,
Beside the springing well
Of life and peace—and heard Thee there
Its healing virtues tell.

Dead to the world, we dream no more
Of sinful pleasures now;
Our deep, divine unfailing spring
Of grace and glory, Thou!

No hope of rest in aught beside,
No beauty, Lord, we see
And like Samaria's daughter seek,
And find our all in Thee.—SEL.

Baptize in the Bible.

In an editorial on "A Tract on Baptism" in No. 3, of the EVANGELIST are some statements, which though doubtless not intentionally misleading do not however, represent facts as they are.

Whatever our faith or belief may be, we dare not try to establish it by a misuse of facts. If these are against us, let us not, blinded, by a false zeal, persist in opposing them; but let us bow our hearts to the truth and humbly accept it.

Integrity, to "Observe all the essential facts, parts, or properties in any given case," is a law of Logic, the violation of which has been a fruitful source of mischief. This may be done by quoting an author only in part on any given topic, or by taking a sentence out of its context to prove something else than the author intended. Or, this law may be violated in drawing conclusions from insufficient or incomplete premises. In any of these cases, though the reasoning may be good yet the conclusions are false. Especially when reasoning upon such momentous subjects as those involving salvation or those which bring in question the beliefs of millions of people should a man be careful in his statements. No man is justified even if in ignorance, to give wrong impressions by false reasonings and if such impressions are given intentionally it amounts to positive sin.

Our Editor says, "Robinson in his Greek and English lexicon in defining the word Baptizo says it is 'frequentative in form' [denotes repeated action]." This gives the impression that Robinson meant that Baptize denoted repeated action. But Robinson says, "a frequentative in form, but apparently not in signification," limiting "frequentative" only to form and not to signification. This can be corroborated by numerous examples.

Continuing his remarks, our brother says, "and in a note adds, 'Greek writers from Plato on use Baptize everywhere, to sink, to immerse, to overwhelm wholly or partially.'" This is a violation of the law of integrity; for in reading this the impression is gained that the New Testament Greek writers also are meant, and that consequently baptize in the Bible meant to sink, to immerse, to overwhelm wholly or partially." But by "the Greeks" Robinson evidently meant the Heathen Greeks, for in the close of this same sentence and the principal part of it Robinson says, "yet in Hellenistic [the N. Test. Greek] usage, and especially in reference to the rite of baptism it would seem to have expressed not always simply immersion, but the more general idea of ablution or affusion." And what our editor says of the first part of the sentence, he must with equal honesty say of this. "This is not only the opinion of all honest and able scholars, but it is a fact. Robinson does not give it as an opinion of his but as an undeniable truth."

But the most serious, if not inexcusable violation of this law was made in quoting Robinson's definition of Baptize in Classic Greek instead of his definition of the word in the New Test. or Hellenistic Greek. For Robinson after defining Baptize as used by the Classic writers or heathen Greeks which our brother has quoted, expressly says, "In New Testament, 1. to wash, to lave, to cleanse by washing. Mid. and Pass. aorist in mid. sense, to wash one's self i. e. one's hands or person, to perform ablution." and proceeds to prove it from the N. T. and Septuagint [Greek Old Test.]

2. To Baptize to administer the rite of baptism.

If his authority is worth anything on the former definition is it not on this? And be it remembered that we need not be concerned about the heathen or classic use but about the New Test. use. Our Christianity was not given by a number of heathen Greeks, but by Jesus Christ and his apostles, and their use of the word, the religious use, must settle the meaning for us. That you readers may see that this is "the opinion of all honest and able scholars" I will name a few who hold this opinion: Calvin, Luther (see his translation of baptesprensget—besprinkled Rev. 18:13) Beza, Bretschneider, Reinhold, Bloomfield, Dr. Dwight, Dr. Henderson, Dr. Owen, Dr. Hill, St. Mary's College, Dr. Adam Clark, Dr. John Dick, Haupt, Olshausen, Dr. Cummings, Dr. Miller of Princetown, Dr. Edward Beecher, Dr. Philip Schaff, et al.

Lest some may question the honesty of these men who are among the greatest scholars of the age, let us look at some Bible References for ourselves, for this authority must be conclusive.

The Septuagint, a translation of the Old Testament from the Original Hebrew into Greek, made about 250 years before Christ by seventy Jews, from which Christ himself quoted largely, established the religious idea of bapto and baptizo. It is to this we should go rather than to the heathen Greeks for the scriptural use of these words. For with this version the Apostles and Christ himself were thoroughly acquainted. This with the New Test. represent Hellenistic Greek, and this will help us to understand the use of Baptizo in the N. T.

The first use of Baptizo in the Septuagint we find in Isaiah 21:4. "My heart panted; fearfulness affrighted [baptized] me. The next we find in 2 Kings 5:14. "Then he went down and dipped [baptized] himself seven times in Jordan according to the saying of the man of God." Thus he baptized himself in Jordan "according to the saying of the man of God. In the 10th verse we have the saying of the man of God. "Go and wash in Jordan seven times." Notice Elisha said, "Go and wash" [luo] not dip, bapto as it is usually quoted; and Naaman did according to the saying of the man of God, i. e. "wash." His washing however, the seventy Jews call a baptism; the English translators called it a dip. Dip, however, in the time that the Bible was translated and even later had a different use, as in Rev. 19:13. "And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood." This evidently refers to Isa. 63:2, 3. The original is bebamenon, the Origen, himself a Greek, in citing this passage uses errantismenon—sprinkling. The Latin has tinctum sanguine—tinctured, sprinkled with blood. Luther uses besprengat, besprinkled; and the revised version uses sprinkled. A similar use is found in Milton—

"A cold shuddering dew dips me all over."

Nor is this remarkable; other words of Bible times have undergone similar and as radical changes. Thus prevent in the Bible means to go before and not to hinder, oppose as now. "The star prevents the morning." "In morning shall my prayers prevent thee."

In Judith 12:7 is the third use of Baptizo. She went out in the night into the valley of Bethulia and washed [ebaptisato] herself in a fountain [paga spring] of water by [en in] the camp." Here it evidently means to purify as it is said, "So she came in clean and remained in the tent until she did eat her meat at evening."

The fourth and only remaining passage in which Baptizo occurs is in Ecclesiasticus 34:25. "He that washeth himself [baptizomenos] after the touching of a dead body, if he touch it again what availeth his washing [loutro]."

Here baptizo and loutro are used interchangeably or synonymously; and loutro is the common word for washing or purifying, as the washing [loutron] of regeneration" etc. But we can tell definitely what this washing or baptism here was. If we turn to Num. 19 we find the purification for such a case to be this: after the proper material is prepared, "a clean person shall take hyssop and dip it in the water, and sprinkle it upon him that toucheth a bone, or one slain, or one dead, or a grave." That this mode of cleansing remained unchanged is evident from Josephus, (Ant. B. 4, C. 4, sec. 6.)

Philo. and Paul himself who says it was the "ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, that sanctifieth to the purification of the flesh." Heb. 9:13. As we shall see by and by. Paul himself includes this under divers baptisms.

Thus far we have seen the religious use of Baptizo (and all its uses for we have given all) in the Septuagint the Bible with which Christ and his Apostles were thoroughly acquainted and from which they quoted. They certainly must have been acquainted with its use of Baptizo. Let us therefore, notice a few examples in the New Testament to see whether they gave it any different signification.

Turn to Heb. 9:10. Here Paul is speaking of the rites and ceremonies of the Jewish Law, not only as to inanimate things, but as they applied to persons and of their efficacy to "make the" worshipper perfect, "as touching the conscience." He expressly mentions the legal abstinences and offerings, the sprinkling of the blood of expiation by the priest, and the sprinkling of the ashes of a heifer upon the unclean, and sums them all up in verse 10, as "being only with meats and drinks and divers washings [diaphorais baptismois—divers baptisms] cardinal ordinances." Here Paul calls all the washings or purifications of the Old Jew, "divers baptisms." Any one acquainted with the old law knows whether these washings baptisms were all immersions, or whether any were. Yet Paul calls them baptisms and that, too, by inspiration. Could Paul have been mistaken? Was he ignorant of Classic Greek?

Again in Mark 7:4. "And when they come from the market place except they wash themselves [baptizontai—baptize themselves] they eat not: and many other things, there be, which they have received to hold, washings [baptismos—baptisms] of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and tables." Here baptizo evidently refers to the rigid purifications of the Jews. This purification was done in various ways. When Christ on a certain occasion dined with a Pharisee, the Pharisee "marvelled" that Christ "had not washed [baptisthe, baptized himself] himself before dinner" Luke 11:38. Mark in 7:3 explains this custom, "For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands diligently [Marg. "up to the elbow"] eat not." However in this place Mark uses the word nipto for wash while Luke referring to the same custom as quoted above used baptizo. It might be noticed in connection that the word rendered "tables in the above quotation is not properly tables but as the Greek has it Klinae, Latin lectus, that is, as Robinson says, "a bed," a couch, a sofa, a divan, for sitting or reclining [compare Luke 17:34.] "Spec. a triclimum, i. e. the couch on which they reclined at meals," and quotes Mark 7:4. compare John 13:23. See also Smith's Dictionaries of Antiquities, articles lectus and triclimum. The Learned Home refers to them thus:—"The more opulent had (as those in the East still have) fine carpets, couches, or divans, sofas, on which they sat lay and slept. In later times their couches were splendid, and the frames inlaid with ivory and the coverlets rich and perfumed. On these sofas, in the latter ages of the Jewish State, [that is at the time of Christ] they universally reclined when taking their meals, resting on their side with their heads toward the table." (Int. Vol. 11 p. 154)

These klinae, or couches, Mark says the Jews baptized. Mark also says concerning the washing of hands, "holding the tradition of the elders." See precedent in 2 Kings 3:11. Also Robinson on nipto. "The usual mode of ablution in the East is by pouring water upon the hands; this is done by a servant. See his Bible Researches in Palest. II. p. 451, III. p. 26.

We might also call attention to the numerous references of the "baptism of the Holy Spirit."

But as there is a marked similarity in all we will refer to but one. In Acts 11:15. "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, even as on us at the beginning [see Acts 2.] "And I remembered the word of the Lord, how that he said John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." see verse 17. How was this baptism performed? Peter says, "And they were astonished because that on the